

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action dated August 22, 2005 and the references cited therein. In response thereto, claims 1-17 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and new claims 18-22 are added and pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Weisman et al. (US 2003/0014329). Applicant hereby respectfully traverses the rejection in light of the newly submitted claims 18-22.

Claim 18 recites a method in a computerized system for building a custom specification and a quote for a piece of equipment, comprising: electronically soliciting from and selecting by a user a general specification of the equipment; electronically soliciting from and selecting by the user different upfit options for various components for building the custom specification for the equipment; and automatically generating and presenting to the user a subtotal cost for the various components of the equipment and a total cost for the custom specification for the equipment.

Weisman discloses a system and method for cataloguing, displaying and retrieving information and for ordering and acquiring spare parts and/or accessories for vehicles for locomotion. More particularly, Weisman discloses **identifying** a desired vehicle for the purpose of **ordering and acquiring** spare parts and/or accessories. As described in Weisman, “[T]he system is **now** ready to accept more specific characterization concerning the item sought. The “item” in Weisman is defined as spare parts and/or accessories. (See page 2, paragraphs [0039] to page 3, paragraph [0042]). Nowhere in Weisman does it disclose or teach a method of building a custom specification and a quote for a piece of equipment. In Weisman, the vehicle has been built, and a user simply identifies the vehicle and orders and acquires spare parts and/or accessories; whereas the claimed invention provides a method of building a custom specification of a piece of equipment by interactively selecting different upfit options for various components of the piece of equipment to be built. In addition, Weisman fails to disclose or teach automatically generating and presenting to the user a subtotal cost for the various components of the equipment and **a total cost for the custom specification for the equipment**. As described

in Weisman, the cost displayed is **the cost of the selected item**, not a total cost for the custom specification for the equipment (see page 3, paragraph [0042])). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Weisman.

Claims 19-22 which are dependent from claim 18 are also patentable for at least the same reason above.

Conclusion


In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application and a favorable response are respectfully requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues, please contact the undersigned at 612-752-7367.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Customer Number 25763

Date: Jan. 23, 2006

By: 
Min (Amy) S. Xu Reg. No. 39,536
(612) 752-7367